UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/063,958	05/29/2002	Akira Koseki	JP920010018US1	2376

47049 7590 03/08/2007

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES
409 BROAD STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15143

EXAMINER	
KENDALL, CHUCK O	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/063,958	KOSEKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chuck O. Kendall	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 February 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 May 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed 02/12/2007.

2. Claims 1 – 17 are still pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al. US 6018, 799 in view of Moore 6,625,746 B1.

Regarding claim 1, Wallace discloses a compiling method for converting into object code a program written in source code comprising the steps of:

allocating registers for a program to be compiled (4:1 – 5, see register stack and compile target programs); and

generating object code based on the register allocation, wherein said step of allocating registers includes the steps of allocating logical registers for instructions in said program (6:14 – 35, for logical registers see virtual registers, note: virtual registers

are assigned to the pseudo registers as taught in 7:20 – 22, and are therefore both being interpreted as the logical registers).

Wallace doesn't expressly disclose wherein performing mapping between said logical registers and physical registers so that said physical registers that are live at a procedure call in said program to be compiled are allocated from the bottom of the register. However, Moore in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses mapping the physical register and the logical destination register and that the allocated registers are the functional registers i.e. live registers see (12:7 – 35) that it would be advantageous for instructions that are close to the physical bottom of the instruction stack to be used to allocation new instructions. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wallace and Moore because it would enable allocating new instructions to unused slot.

Regarding claim 2, the compiling method according to claim 1, wherein, at said mapping step, allocation is done so that logical registers that are live across more procedure calls are first allocated (13:55 – 67, see "continues to a 'determine new live registers' procedure 803").

Regarding claim 3, the compiling method according to claim 1, wherein, at said mapping step, allocation is done, so that the logical registers that are allocated first are the logical registers that are live across a procedure call at which fewer logical registers are live at the same time (3:13 – 20, shows mapping one of the pseudo registers *logical registers,* to use the plurality of stack registers *physical registers* also, see FIG 5.A, 503, 505 and 507 and all associated text).

Regarding claim 4, Wallace anticipates a code generation method for generating code for a program that controls a computer comprising the steps of:

generating code while confirming that registers are allocated for a predetermined instruction (6:14 – 35, for logical registers see virtual registers); and

upon the calling of the procedure, so long as there is a vacancy in operation resources, copying said registers residing in the register stack, to free registers located at the bottom of said register stack (12:35 – 40, see saves copy of the register stack and 12:44 – 46, "707 that saves register stack state that exists at the end of the basic block").

Regarding claim 5, Wallace anticipates a method, for employing a stack register when a processor with a register stack executes a program, comprising the steps of:

when a different procedure is called in a predetermined procedure, said predetermined procedure called before the different procedure, reallocating registers that are allocated for the execution of said predetermined procedure and are live when said different procedure is called, and calling said different procedure (9:25 – 35, for call see "invoked", for live see "determines when the value in a register is dead"); and

upon the return from said different procedure, restoring the register image to the state immediately before the reallocation (12:35 – 38, shows copying register stack and 12: 47 – 50, shows normalizing the register stack, which Examiner interprets to be restoring register image).

Regarding claim 6, the stack register employment method according to claim 5, wherein said step of reallocating said registers and calling said different procedure includes the steps of:

sorting and reallocating, from the bottom of said register stack, said registers that are live when said different procedure is called (FIG. 5D, 557 also see all associated text, e.g. 13:57 – 67).

Regarding claim 7, Wallace anticipates a method, for employing a stack register when a program is executed by a processor with a register stack, comprising the steps of:

each time a procedure is called, packing and allocating existing logical registers (6:56 – 61, for *logical registers* see pseudo register and for *packing* see optimization);

performing said procedure, and restoring the register image to the state before the packing (12:35 – 38, shows copying register stack and 12: 47 – 50, shows normalizing the register stack, which Examiner interprets to be restoring register image).

Regarding claim 8, which claims similarly as already addressed limitations recited in claim 1, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 9, the compiler according to claim 8, wherein said register allocator allocates said logical registers and said physical registers first for an important portion of said program to be compiled (6:14 – 35, for logical registers see virtual registers, note: virtual registers are assigned to the pseudo registers as taught in 7:20 – 22, and are therefore both being interpreted as the logical registers); and

wherein, while for a less important portion of said program, said code generator generates compensation code for allocation of said logical registers and for allocation of said physical registers for the important portion (6:14 – 25, see code generator segment 211 and also see 6:55 – 61 for register allocation).

Regarding claim 10, Wallace discloses an apparatus for converting into machine language code the source code of a program written in a program language, the complier comprising:

a register allocator, for allocating registers for instructions in said program to be compiled (4:1 – 5, see register stack and compile target programs); and

a code generator, for generating object code based on the register allocation process performed by said register allocator, wherein said code generator generates code while confirming that registers are allocated for predetermined instructions (6:14 – 25, see code generator segment 211 and also see 6:55 – 61 for register allocation). Wallace doesn't expressly disclose wherein, upon a procedure being called, said code generator, so long as there is a vacancy in operation resources, copies said registers residing in a register stack, to free registers that are located at the bottom of said register stack.

However, Moore in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses mapping the physical register and the logical destination register and that the allocated registers are the functional registers i.e. live registers see (12:7 – 35) that it would be advantageous for instructions that are close to the physical bottom of the instruction stack to be used to allocation new instructions. Therefore it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wallace and Moore because it would enable allocating new instructions to unused slot.

Regarding claim 11, Wallace discloses a computer comprising:

input means, for entering source code of a program (5:33 – 35, see CD-ROM); and

a compiler, for compiling said source code and converting the compiled code into machine language code, wherein, before a different procedure is called in a predetermined procedure of a program to be compiled, and generates code, for restoring the register image, upon the return from said different procedure, to the state immediately before the reallocation (12:35 – 38, shows copying register stack and 12: 47 – 50, shows normalizing the register stack, which Examiner interprets to be restoring register image). Wallace doesn't expressly disclose wherein said compiler generates code for reallocating registers that are allocated for the execution of said predetermined procedure and that are live when said different procedure is called. However, Moore in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses mapping the physical register and the logical destination register and that the allocated registers are the functional registers i.e. live registers see (12:7 – 35) that it would be advantageous for instructions that are close to the physical bottom of the instruction stack to be used to allocation new instructions. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wallace and Moore because it would enable allocating new instructions to unused slot.

Regarding claim 12, which discloses similarly to claim 1, see rationale above as previously addressed.

Regarding claim 13, Wallace discloses a method, for controlling a computer for conversion of a program to be executed, which permits said computer to perform, the conversion program comprising:

a process for generating code while confirming that registers are allocated for a predetermined instruction (6:14 – 30, see code generator segment 211 and also see 6:55 – 61 for register allocation). Wallace doesn't expressly disclose a process for, upon the calling of the procedure, so long as there is a vacancy in operation resources, copying said registers residing in said register stack, to free registers located at the bottom of said register stack. However, Moore in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses mapping the physical register and the logical destination register and that the allocated registers are the functional registers i.e. live registers see (12:7 – 35) that it would be advantageous for instructions that are close to the physical bottom of the instruction stack to be used to allocation new instructions. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wallace and Moore because it would enable allocating new instructions to unused slot.

Regarding claim 14, which describes the process version of claim 5, see rational as previously discussed above and with regards to a process see (FIG. 5A and 5B).

Regarding claim 15, Wallace discloses a storage medium on which a conversion program is stored that controls a computer for conversion of a program to be executed,

said conversion program permitting said computer to perform, the conversion program comprising:

a process for allocating logical registers for instructions in said program to be executed (4:1 – 5, see register stack and compile target programs). Wallace doesn't expressly disclose a process for performing mapping between said logical registers and physical registers, so that said physical registers that are live at a procedure call in said program to be compiled are allocated from the bottom of the register stack. and

a process for generating object code based on the mapping process(6:14 – 30, see code generator segment 211 and also see 6:55 – 61 for register allocation).

However, Moore in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses mapping the physical register and the logical destination register and that the allocated registers are the functional registers i.e. live registers see (12:7 – 35) that it would be advantageous for instructions that are close to the physical bottom of the instruction stack to be used to allocation new instructions. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wallace and Moore because it would enable allocating new instructions to unused slot.

Regarding claim 16, Wallace discloses a storage medium on which a conversion program is stored that controls a computer for conversion of a program to be executed, said conversion program permitting said computer to perform, the conversion program comprising:

a process for generating code while confirming that registers are allocated for a predetermined instruction(6:14 – 30, see code generator segment 211 and also see

6:55 – 61 for register allocation). Wallace doesn't expressly disclose a process for, upon the calling of the procedure, so long as there is a vacancy in operation resources, copying said registers residing in said register stack to free registers located at the bottom of said register stack.

However, Moore in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses mapping the physical register and the logical destination register and that the allocated registers are the functional registers i.e. live registers see (12:7 – 35) that it would be advantageous for instructions that are close to the physical bottom of the instruction stack to be used to allocation new instructions. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wallace and Moore because it would enable allocating new instructions to unused slot.

Regarding claim 17, Wallace discloses a storage medium on which a conversion program is stored that controls a computer for conversion of a program to be executed, said conversion program permitting said computer to perform, the conversion program comprising:

a process for, upon the return from said different procedure, restoring the register image to the state immediately before the reallocation (12:35 – 38, shows copying register stack and 12: 47 – 50, shows normalizing the register stack, which Examiner interprets to be restoring register image). Wallace doesn't expressly disclose a process for, when a different procedure is called in a predetermined procedure, reallocating registers that are allocated for the execution of said predetermined procedure and that are live when said different procedure is called, and calling said different procedure.

However, Moore in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses mapping the physical register and the logical destination register and that the allocated registers are the functional registers i.e. live registers see (12:7 – 35) that it would be advantageous for instructions that are close to the physical bottom of the instruction stack to be used to allocation new instructions. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wallace and Moore because it would enable allocating new instructions to unused slot.

Correspondence information

8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-272-3698. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ck.